

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-20 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 11 are in independent form and claims 21-31 have previously been cancelled. By the present amendment claims 1, 4, and 14 have been amended and claim 7 has been cancelled.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner specifically stated “Regarding Claims 4 and 14, it is unclear whether “another metal” refers to other metals listed in Claims 3 and 13, respectively, or to any other metal.” By the present amendment it has been made clear that another metal refers to any other metal. Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claims 4 and 14 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph has been overcome.

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 were rejected under 35 USC §102(a and e) as being anticipated by Van Steenkiste et al. US Pat. No. 6,139,913. Rejection of a claim under 35 USC §102 requires that each and every limitation of the claim be found within the cited reference. If a single limitation is not found within the cited reference then the rejection of the claims is inappropriate and must be withdrawn. The Examiner makes a very cursory review of the cited reference stating that it teaches spraying conductive metal particles larger than 50 microns on a brass substrate “resulting in a discontinuous surface”. The Examiner directs Applicants to column 4, lines 31-33 and column 4 line 45 through column 6 line 10. The Examiner then states “since the method and materials are analogous to those of applicant’s, it would be expected that the claimed structural features, such as aspect ratios and height, and properties, such as contact resistance, would be achieved.” This is simply inappropriate on the Examiner’s part. There is no disclosure anywhere within Van Steenkiste et al. to suggest that the coatings produced by

Van Steenkiste et al. are discontinuous. In fact, it is clear from a reading of Van Steenkiste et al. that the invention is directed toward providing a uniform coating on the substrate that is being coated with the material. In fact the entire thrust of the patent is directed toward finding the appropriate conditions to deposit large particles having a size of 50 microns or larger uniformly across a coating surface. It is inappropriate for the Examiner to merely assume that since the cited reference and the application have in common the use of a kinetic spray apparatus that the structures produced by the two must be identical. This is not the case. The present invention specifically utilizes the kinetic spray process to produce an electrical connector that is formed from the combination of a first surface of an electrically conductive material having embedded on the surface a plurality of spaced apart particles of a second electrically conductive material to form a discontinuous layer raised on the first surface and having a contact resistance of less than 10 milli-Ohms. Such a structure is not disclosed in cited reference of Van Steenkiste et al. thus the rejection of Claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom under 35 USC §102 based on Van Steenkiste et al. is inappropriate and must be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 6 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Chakraborty et al. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 7. Thus this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 6 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Goto et al. US Pat. No. 6,042,984. As stated above the subject matter of claim 7 has been incorporated into claim 1 thus this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Applicant's attorney respectfully submits that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests such allowance.

The Patent Office is authorized to charge or refund any fee deficiency or excess to
Deposit Account No. 08-2789.

Respectfully submitted,

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Randall L. Shoemaker", is written over a horizontal line.

April 4, 2005
Date

Randall L. Shoemaker, Registration No. 43,118
Howard and Howard Attorneys, P.C.
The Pinehurst Office Center, Suite 101
39400 Woodward Ave.
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304-5151
(248) 723-0425

G:\D\Delphi Patent\IP00632\Patent\Amendment01.doc